

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 7, 10 – 12, and 18 – 21 were pending in the final Office Action mailed February 28, 2011. Claims 1, 10, and 18 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 – 7, 10 – 12, and 18 – 21 remain pending in this Application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1 – 7, 10 - 12, and 18 – 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft Project 2000 as evidenced by Pyron et al., Using Microsoft Project 2000 (2000; hereinafter “MS1”) and Security for Microsoft Project Central (2000; hereinafter “MS2”) in view of Clark, U.S. Patent No. 7,062, 449. This rejection is respectfully traversed, as MS1, MS2, and Clark, taken together or in part, fail to teach or suggest the Applicants’ invention as now claimed.

The Applicants’ invention as now set forth in exemplary amended independent claim 1 includes a method for tracking the status of a workflow. The method includes instantiating an instance of a workflow on a computing device by a workflow user. The workflow user is assigned to a role in the workflow. The method further includes generating a weblog on a computing device to track an instance of the workflow. The weblog is accessible to weblog members. The weblog members include members who are workflow users and members who do not have a role in the instance of the workflow. The weblog is configured for a weblog member who does not have a role in the instance of the workflow to have permission to manually post an entry in the weblog.

MS1 teaches updates that are made manually by workflow users. To use the features of MS Project, one must be executing MS Project and be a workflow user. The Office Action cites MS1 at page 66 as teaching that a Project Central user can see project and resource information for projects the user might not be assigned to. However, there is no teaching of this user generating a weblog. The Office Action recognizes this at page 7, and relies on MS2 to show a weblog. Regardless of whether MS2 teaches a weblog that can be viewed by users based on their role in a project, MS2 only provides viewing capabilities. Specifically, MS2 at page 5

states that a manager can view specific projects, but does not teach or suggest posting an entry in a weblog. MS1, on the other hand, teaches that users can post information to Microsoft Project Central, but does not teach or suggest non-project members posting entries to a weblog.

Clark tracks its own internal workflow and does not indicate that non-workflow users can access a weblog. The Office Action at page 9 acknowledges that Clark does not distinguish weblog users who are workflow users from weblog users who are not workflow users. Clark likewise fails to teach or suggest non-workflow users, i.e., weblogs member who do not have a role in the instance of the workflow, permitted to manually post an entry in the weblog.

Thus, no combination of these references teaches or suggests “configuring the weblog for a weblog member who does not have a role in the instance of the workflow to have permission to manually post an entry in the weblog,” as recited in amended independent claim 1.

For all the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 – 7 are in condition for allowance. Independent claims 10 and 18 contain limitations similar to that of claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that claims 10 and 18, and dependent claims 11, 12, and 19 - 21 are also in condition for allowance.

2. Claims 1, 10, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwanke, U.S. patent Publication No. 2003/008508 (sic) in view of Udell, Telling a Story (2001) and further in view of Doctorow et al., Essential Blogging (2002) (hereinafter “Doctorow”), MS1, and MS2. This rejection is respectfully traversed, as Schwanke, Udell, Doctorow, MS1, and MS2, taken together or in part, fail to teach or suggest the Applicants’ invention as now claimed.

Schwanke does not teach weblogs or weblog members. The Office Action at page 29 acknowledges this and relies on Udell for teaching posting an entry to a weblog to indicate that a workflow action has occurred. While Udell teaches weblogs, Udell does not teach or suggest that a weblog member who does not have a role in the instance of the workflow can manually post an entry in the weblog, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

The Office Action acknowledges that Schwanke and Udell do not teach managing weblog member permissions, and relies on Doctorow to provide this missing limitation. Doctorow at page 59 teaches that a blog owner can add new members to a blog. Doctorow at

page 60 further teaches features offered to invited team members on a blog. Doctorow at pages 119-120 further describes how authors can be added to a blog. However, while these sections of Doctorow are cited in the Office Action to refer to the addition of blog members, Doctorow does not teach or suggest that a blog member who does not have a role in the instance of the workflow can manually post an entry in the weblog, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

MS1 and MS2 likewise fail to teach this limitation for reasons described above.

Thus, no combination of these references can teach or suggest “configuring the weblog for a weblog member who does not have a role in the instance of the workflow to have permission to manually post an entry in the weblog,” as recited in amended independent claim 1.

For all the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Independent claims 10 and 18 contain limitations similar to that of Claim 1, and are therefore in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicant(s) submit(s) that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants’ representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 12-2158.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 31, 2011
Reg. No. 58,037

Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003
Fax No.: (508) 303-0005

/Timothy P. Collins/
Timothy P. Collins
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Mount Royal Office Park
Marlborough, MA 01752